

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 21, 23, 25-31, 59, 61, 63-69, 71, 73 and 75-81 are now pending, wherein claims 21, 23, 59, 61, 71 and 73 are amended, and claims 22, 24, 60, 62, 72 and 74 are canceled.

Claims 21-31 and 59-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for indefiniteness. The Request for Continued Examination (RCE) being submitted with this Reply is requesting entry of the amendments filed on February 3, 2011, and it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now definite for at least the reasons set forth in the remarks accompanying that amendment. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 21-23, 25, 26, 59-61, 63, 64, 70-73, 75 and 76 are rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 7,283,630 to Doljack (“Doljack”) and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0041214 to Brogger et al. (“Brogger”). Claims 24, 27-29, 62, 65-67, 74 and 77-79 are rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the combination of Doljack, Brogger and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0145146 to Miolla et al. (“Miolla”). Claims 30, 31, 68, 69, 80 and 81 are rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of the combination of Doljack, Brogger and Applicant Admitted Prior Art (“AAPA”). These grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 21 is amended to include the elements of dependent claims 22 and 24, and thus now recites that:

- the attributes assigned to the unique code strings are stored within the database of the secure server, and

- the validating authenticity step further includes storing current location information of the marked instantiations when the tracking parameters are determined to be valid

The Office Action cites the combination of Doljack, Brogger and Miolla to reject claim 24. This combination, however, does not disclose or suggest at least the features of claim 21 reproduced above, and it would not have been obvious to combine Doljack, Brogger and Miolla to arrive at the method recited in claim 21.

Independent claims 59 and 71 are amended to include similar subject matter to that discussed above with regard to claim 21, and are patentably distinguishable for similar reasons. The various dependent claims are patentably distinguishable at least by virtue of their dependency. Accordingly, withdrawal of all outstanding grounds of rejection is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323, Docket No. 102980.58649US2.

Respectfully submitted,

May 10, 2011

/Stephen W. Palan, Reg. No. 43,420/
Stephen W. Palan
Registration No. 43,420

CROWELL & MORING LLP
SWP:swp